



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/510,856	02/23/2000	Yoshinari Higuchi	SONYJP 3.0-103	3754
530	7590	03/25/2004	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			YODER III, CHRISS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/510,856

Applicant(s)

HIGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Chriss S. Yoder, III

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) ~~1-28~~⁶⁻²⁸ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 6-7, 9-11, 16-17, 20, 22-23, and 28 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawakami (US Patent # 4,598,243).

2. In regard to claim 6, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera (column 1, lines 29-30) comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery (column 2, lines 20-36; column 7, lines 14-31; and column 8, lines 56-58; by identifying the battery the device is obtaining the capacity of the battery using known information of applicable batteries), a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value (column 2, lines 25-32; and figure 2: 100, 102, E1, and E2), a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value (column 2, lines 25-35; and figure 2: E1, E2), and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value (column 2, lines 25-27).

3. In regard to claim 7, note Kawakami discloses the use of a detecting means for detecting the battery voltage (column 2, lines 21-23).

4. In regard to claim 9, note Kawakami discloses that the obtaining means obtains the capacity value from the battery pack (column 8, lines 5-12; the switches 30, 412, and 422 output the capacity data from the battery).
5. In regard to claim 10, note Kawakami discloses that the predetermined value is the capacity value of the battery (column 2, lines 30-34; using the capacity data obtained it is used to set the correction value, and the information about the battery is known).
6. In regard to claim 11, note Kawakami discloses that the setting means sets the correction value to a first value when the capacity value exceeds a first predetermined value and sets the correction value to a second value when the capacity value does not exceed the first predetermined amount (figure 2: it sets the values E1 and E2 dependent upon whether the capacity value exceeds Ea; if the capacity value exceeds Ea then the correction value is set to be E1, otherwise, the correction value is set to E2).
7. In regard to claim 16, note Kawakami discloses that the generating means generates the warning signal when the detected battery voltage is greater than a minimum operating voltage (column 1, lines 40-42).
8. In regard to claim 17, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera (column 1, lines 29-30) and battery pack (figure 3: 210; a battery casing) comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery (column 2, lines 20-36; column 7, lines 14-31; and column 8, lines 56-58; by identifying the battery the device is obtaining the capacity of the battery using known information of applicable batteries), a setting means for setting a

correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value (column 2, lines 25-32; and figure 2: 100, 102, E1, and E2), a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value (column 2, lines 25-35; and figure 2: E1, E2), and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value (column 2, lines 25-27).

9. In regard to claims 20, 22-23, and 28, these are method claims, corresponding to the apparatus of claims 6, 10-11, and 16, respectively. Therefore, claims 20, 22-23, and 28 have been analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect claims 6, 10-11, and 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 12-13 and 24-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami (US Patent # 4,598,243).

11. In regard to claim 12, note Kawakami discloses that the setting means sets the correction value to a first value when the capacity value exceeds a first predetermined value and sets the correction value to a second value when the capacity value does not exceed the first predetermined amount (figure 2: it sets the values E1 and E2 dependent upon whether the capacity value exceeds Ea; if the capacity value exceeds Ea then the correction value is set to be E1,

otherwise, the correction value is set to E2). Therefore, it can be seen that the Kawakami device fails to set the correction value to the second value when the capacity exceeds a second predetermined value and sets the correction value to zero when the capacity doesn't exceed the second predetermined value.

However, the Kawakami reference does disclose that instead of two batteries used in figure 2 (100 and 102) there can be a plurality of battery types used (column 20, lines 20-21). Because of the graph only shows the use of two batteries, if three different batteries were used instead of two, it would be implied that there would be a second predetermined value in order to calculate the correction value in order to compensate for the difference in time until the low battery warning is generated. As for the correction value being set to zero, this is merely a reference point as to where there is no correction for the time difference (this would be implied and obvious to be any point where the device is set to be the primary warning time). For example if E2 was established as the reference point for zero, then E1 would be a normal correction value equivalent to the "first value" and "second value" as described by applicant. Kawakami teaches that the use of a plurality of types of batteries can be used in order to extend the life of the device and to adjust the price of the device dependent on the price of batteries. Therefore, it would have been implied and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kawakami device to set the correction value to the second value when the capacity exceeds a second predetermined value and sets the correction value to zero when the capacity doesn't exceed the second predetermined value in order to include the use of a plurality of types of batteries.

12. In regard to claim 13, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery, a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value, a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value, and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value. Therefore, it can be seen that the Kawakami device fails to explicitly state that the correcting means subtracts the correction value from the low power warning voltage value. However, it would be implied and obvious that the correcting means subtracts the correction value from the low power warning voltage value (in figure 2: E1 and E2; E2 is considered to be the equivalent of the low power warning voltage value, and E1 is the correction value which is subtracted from the low power warning voltage).

13. In regard to claims 24-25, these are method claims, corresponding to the apparatus of claims 12-13, respectively. Therefore, claims 24-25 have been analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect claims 12-13.

14. Claims 8, 14, 15, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami (US Patent # 4,598,243) in view of Lee (US Patent # 6,157,169).

15. In regard to claim 8, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery, a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value, a correcting means for correcting a low power

warning voltage value using the correction value, and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value. Therefore, it can be seen that the Kawakami device fails to disclose the use of a storage device for storing the capacity value, and the obtaining means gets the capacity value from the storage means. Lee disclose the use of capacity values to obtain the residual value of the battery pack in order to notify the user of the remaining life of the device which would inherently have a storage means for storing the capacity value in order to compare with the current voltage in order to output the remaining capacity. Lee teaches that the use of a storage device to store capacity values is necessary in order to output the residual capacity. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kawakami device to include the use of a storage device to store capacity values in order to output the residual capacity information.

16. In regard to claim 14, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery, a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value, a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value, and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value. Therefore, it can be seen that the Kawakami device fails to determine the residual power of the battery based on capacity value. Lee discloses the determination of residual power of the

battery based on capacity values (column 7, lines 45-65). Lee teaches that the determination of residual power of the battery based on capacity values is preferred in order to detect how much longer the device can be used before a power failure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kawakami device to determine the residual power of the battery in order to detect how much longer the device can be used before a power failure and to notify the user how much time is left.

17. In regard to claim 15, note Lee discloses the display of the residual power when the voltage is greater than the warning voltage (figure 11).

18. In regard to claims 21, 26, and 27, these are method claims, corresponding to the apparatus of claims 8, 14, and 15, respectively. Therefore, claims 21, 26 and 27 have been analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect claims 8, 14, and 15.

19. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami (US Patent # 4,598,243) in view of "Smart Battery Data Specification".

20. In regard to claim 18, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera and battery pack comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery, a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value, a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value, and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value. Therefore, it can

be seen that the Kawakami device lacks the use of a storage means in the battery pack that stores the capacity value. The "Smart Battery Data Specification" discloses the use of a battery having a storage means that outputs the capacity value to the device (chapter 5; and page 26: 5.1.17). The "Smart Battery Data Specification" teaches that the use of a battery having a storage means that outputs the capacity value to the device is preferred in order to provide the user with the full capacity ("tank size") of the battery. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kawakami device to include a storage means in the battery for outputting the capacity value to the device is preferred in order to provide the user with the full size of the battery even if the battery is not full.

21. In regard to claim 19, note Kawakami discloses the use of a video camera and battery pack comprising an obtaining means for obtaining a capacity value of a battery, a setting means for setting a correction value based on whether the capacity value exceeds a predetermined value, a correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value using the correction value, and a generating means for generating a warning signal when a detected battery voltage is less than or equal to the corrected low power warning voltage value. Therefore, it can be seen that the Kawakami device lacks the use of detecting means in the battery pack that detects the battery voltage. The "Smart Battery Data Specification" discloses the use of a battery having a detecting means in the battery pack that detects the battery voltage (chapter 5; and page 24: 5.1.10). The "Smart Battery Data Specification" teaches that the use of a battery having a

detecting means in the battery pack that detects the battery voltage is preferred in order to provide the power management system built into the electronics with an accurate measurement of the present voltage so that it can characterize the battery. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kawakami device to include the use of a detecting means in the battery pack that detects the battery voltage in order to provide the power management system built into the electronics with an accurate measurement of the present voltage so that it can characterize the battery.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chriss S. Yoder, III whose telephone number is (703) 305-0344. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-HELP.

CSY
March 18, 2004


JULE
PRIMARY EXAMINER